

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 20, 2002 LR 6, 292

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Robak, that was just a one-minute warning. I wasn't sure whether you understood that or not, but you still have a minute left if you'd like to use it. Thank you. Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR COORDSEN: That was fast for me, Mr. Speaker, in case anyone was wondering. The reason I put my light on is to raise a question, not so much of content as of form. If you've not looked at the amendment, it is my concern that we ought not to be putting language that is more properly statutory language into the constitution. This amendment, although quite thorough and well spelled out, is something that every time you create, I believe, every time you create specifics in the constitution you create problems at some time in the future. The underlying amendment, the Schimek amendment, I think is one that is in more proper constitutional form and could, in fact, work if the body decided to go that way. But I would...I would invite your attention to the detail of this amendment and ask yourself whether this type of language should be placed into the constitution where it can never be changed except by another constitutional amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Schrock.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, the General Affairs Committee worked yesterday for quite some time, and if you haven't had the opportunity to sit in General Affairs Committee, you don't get a chance to hear all the gambling issues. We've heard all the gambling issues. I thought we put out LR 292CA in a fairly good form. It really mirrors what Iowa is doing. It would give the...it would give the two-mile zone for the five casinos and, Senator Beutler, I commend you. Your idea is innovative. It gets right to the point. It just makes it five or ten minutes closer for the people who want to gamble and they don't have to cross the river. It keeps it out of our local communities and, yet, the revenue, which I don't think is going to be a big issue but it is an issue, will be addressed. I guess I'm disappointed because it was my understanding, after all the work we did, that your amendment would reflect what the committee did, and your amendment leaves out an important part of that and it leaves out the racetracks. And I know Senator